



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/605,695	06/28/2000	Steven Michael Schein	108.0003-00000	6334
22882	7590	01/09/2006	EXAMINER	
MARTIN & FERRARO, LLP 1557 LAKE O'PINES STREET, NE HARTVILLE, OH 44632			DURAN, ARTHUR D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3622	
DATE MAILED: 01/09/2006				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/605,695

Applicant(s)

SCHEIN, STEVEN MICHAEL

Examiner

Arthur Duran

Art Unit

3622

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 December 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7,9-15,17-20,22,23 and 25-37 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7,9-15,17-20,22,23 and 27-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) 25,26 and 32-37 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-7, 9-15, 17-20, 22, 23 and 27-31 have been examined.

***Response to Amendment***

2. The Amendment filed on 12/7/05 is insufficient to overcome the prior rejection.

***Election/Restrictions***

3. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
  - I. Claims 1-23 and 27-31, drawn to targeting media content and media objects to users, classified in class 705/14.
  - II. Claims 25, 26, drawn to detaching and decoding coded headers, classified in class 705/14.
  - III. Claims 32-37, drawn to a hidden search engine, classified in 705.

Inventions I and II are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct from each other if they are shown to be separately usable. In the instant case, invention I has separate utility such as targeting media content and media objects to users. Invention II is drawn to detaching and decoding coded headers related to profiles. These two groups are subcombinations useable together where one method/apparatus does not require the specifics of the other to have utility. See MPEP § 806.05(d).

Inventions I and III are based on different sets of Independent claims. Group I involves targeting media content and media objects to users. Group III involves a hidden search engine.

Art Unit: 3622

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and the search required for Group I is different than the search required for each of Group III, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

During a telephone conversation with Amedeo F. Ferraro (Reg. No. 37,129) on 1/5/2006 a provisional election was made without traverse to prosecute the invention of Group I, claims 1-1-23 and 27-31. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 25, 26 and 32-37 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-7, 9-15, 17-20, 22, 23 and 27-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ginter (5,892,900) in view of Gerace (5,848,396).

*As per independent claim 1, Ginter (col. 325,11. 1-67) discloses:*

*"target content object. . . ."*

*Ginter (col. 197,11. 42-65) discloses: "This mechanism could be used... to distribute customized versions of a piece of content and control access to the various versions in the content object. . . ."*

Art Unit: 3622

*Ginter (col. 38,11. 35-67; col. 138,11. 3-67; col. 156,11. 25-47; and col. 265,11. 28-67; col. 266,11. 1-67; col. 267,11. 1-67; col. 268,11. 1-67; and col. 269,11. 1-67) discloses: "smart object agents. . . ."*

*Ginter (col. 152, 11. 28-39; col. 154,11. 41-67; and col. 174,11. 22-35) discloses: "collect data on end user usage activities. . . ."*

*Ginter (col. 137,11. 3-67; col. 138,11. 1-67; col. 301,11. 65-67; and col. 302,11. 115) shows "media content. . . ."*

*Ginter (the ABSTRACT; cot. 325,11. 1-67; cot. 197,11. 42-65; cot. 38,11. 35-67; cot. 138,11. 3-67; cot. 156,11. 25-47; and col. 265,11. 28-67; cot. 266,11. 1-67; cot. 267,11. 1-67; cot. 268,11. 1-67; cot. 269,11. 1-67; cot. 152, 11. 28-39; cot. 154,11. 41-67; and cot. 174,11. 22-35 and whole document) shows the elements and limitations of claim 1; however,*

*Ginter lacks an explicit recitation of "a data reporter for collecting user activity information representing exercise of a first media object by said at least one user. . . ." even though;*

*Ginter (cot. 152, 11. 28-39; cot. 154,11. 41-67; cot. 174,11. 22-35; cot. 137,11. 367; cot. 138,11. 1-67; cot. 301, 11. 65-67; and cot. 302,11. 1-15) discloses: "collect data on end user usage activities. . . . " In this case, the Examiner interprets the disclosure of*

*Ginter (cot. 152, 11. 28-39; cot. 154,11. 41-67; cot. 174,11. 22-35; cot. 137,11.3-67; cot. 138,11. 1-67; cot. 301,11. 65-67; and cot. 302,11. 1-15) i.e., "collect data on end user usage activities..... as showing "a data reporter for collecting user activity*

*information representing exercise of a first media object by said at least one user. . .*

*."*

*It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to a person of ordinary skill in the art that the disclosure of inter (cot. 152, 11. 28-39; cot. 154, 11. 41-67; cot. 174, 11. 22-35; cot. 137, 11. 3-67; cot. 138, 11. 1-67; cot. 301, 11. 65-67; and cot. 302, lt. 115) would have been selected in accordance with "a data reporter for collecting user activity information representing exercise of a first media object by said at least one user. . . ." because such disclosure would have provided a method enabling 'participants in a business value chain model to create an electronic version of traditional business agreement terms and conditions and further enables these participants to shape and evolve their electronic commerce models as they believe appropriate to their business requirements,' (See'n er col. 8, 11. 40-49).*

As per dependent claims 2-8, inter shows the method of claim 1 and subsequent base claims depending from claim 1.

in e (cot. 137, 11. 3-67; cot. 138, 11. 1-67; cot. 301, 11. 65-67; cot. 302, 11. 1-15; the ABSTRACT; cot. 325, 11. 1-67; cot. 197, 11. 42-65; cot. 38, 11. 35-67; cot. 138, 11. 367; cot. 156, 11. 25-47; and cot. 265, 11. 28-67; col. 266, 11. 1-67; cot. 267, 11. 1-67; cot. 268, 11. 1-67; cot. 269, 11. 1-67; cot. 152, 11. 28-39; cot. 154, 11. 41-67; and cot. 174, 11. 22-35 and whole document) shows the elements and limitations of claims 2-8.

Art Unit: 3622

Ginter lacks explicit recitation of the elements and limitations of claims 2-8, even though Ginter suggests same.

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to a person of ordinary skill in the art that the disclosure of inter (cot. 137,11. 3-67; cot. 138,11. 1-67; col. 301, 11. 65-67; cot. 302,11. 1-15; the ABSTRACT; cot. 325,11. 1-67; cot. 197,11. 42-65; cot. 38,11. 35-67; col. 138,11. 3-67; cot. 156,11. 25-47; and cot. 265,11. 28-67; cot. 266,11. 167; cot. 267,11. 1-67; cot. 268,11. 1-67; cot. 269,11. 1-67; cot. 152, 11. 28-39; cot. 154,11.

41-67; and col. 174,11. 22-35 and whole document) would have been selected in accordance with the elements and limitations of claims 2-8 because such disclosure would have provided a method enabling *"participants in a business value chain model to create an electronic version of traditional business agreement terms and conditions and further enables these participants to shape and evolve their electronic commerce models as they believe appropriate to their business requirements. "* (See' ter cot. 8,11. 40-49).

Independent claim 9 is rejected for substantially the same reasons as independent claim 1.

As per dependent claims 10-16, in e shows the method of claim 9 and subsequent base claims depending from claim 9.

Ginter (cot. 137,11. 3-67; cot. 138,11. 1-67; cot. 301,11. 65-67; cot. 302,11. 1-15; the ABSTRACT; cot. 325,11. 1-67; cot. 197,11. 42-65; cot. 38,11. 35-67; cot. 138,11. 367; cot. 156,11. 25-47; and cot. 265,11. 28-67; cot. 266,11. 1-67; cot. 267,11.

Art Unit: 3622

1-67; cot. 268,11. 1-67; cot. 269,11. 1-67; cot. 152, 11. 28-39; cot. 154,11.-41-67; and cot. 174,11. 22-35 and whole document) shows the elements and limitations of claims 10-16.

Ginter lacks explicit recitation of the elements and limitations of claims 10-16, even though Ginter suggests same.

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to a person of ordinary skill in the art that the disclosure of Ginter(cot. 137,11. 3-67; cot. 138,11. 1-67; cot. 301,11. 65-67; col. 302,11. 1-15; the ABSTRACT; col. 325,11. 1-67; col. 197,11. 42-65; col. 38, 11. 35-67; col. 138,11. 3-67; col. 156,11. 25-47; and col. 265,11. 28-67; col. 266, 11. 167; col. 267,11. 1-67; col. 268,11. 1-67; col. 269,11. 1-67; Col. 152, 11. 28-39; cot. 154, lt. 41-67; and col. 174,11. 22-35 and whole document) would have been selected in accordance with the elements and limitations of claims 10-16 because such disclosure would have provided a method enabling *"participants in a business value chain model to create an electronic version of traditional business agreement terms and conditions and further enables these participants to shape and evolve their electronic commerce models as they believe appropriate to their business requirements. "* (See Ginter col. 8,11. 40-49).

As per independent claim 17, Ginter (col. 325,11. 1-67) discloses:

*"target content object.....*

Ginter (col. 50,11. 50-52) discloses: *"FIG. 15A is an example of a channel header and channel detail records. . . . "*



Ginter (col. 109, 11. 42-50; and col. 111, 11. 16-40) discloses: *"relevant headers, content tags. . . . "*  
Gin= (col. 311, 11. 30-60) discloses: *"account profile that may relate to such content to the repository. . . . "*

Ginter(col. 197,11. 42-65) discloses: *"This mechanism could be used ... to distribute customized versions of a piece of content and control access to the various versions in the content object. ....*

*Ginter* (col. 38,11. 35-67; col. 138,11. 3-67; col. 156,11. 25-47; and col. 265,11. 28-67; col. 266,11. 1-67; col. 267,11. 1-67; col. 268,11. 1-67; and col. 269,11.1-67) discloses: *"smart object agents. . . . "*

*Ginter* (col. 152, 11. 28-39; col. 154,11. 41-67; and col. 174,11. 22-35) discloses: *"collect data on end user usage activities. . . . "*

Ginter (col. 137,11. 3-67; col. 138,11. 1-67; col. 301,11. 65-67; and col. 302,11. 115) shows "media content.....  
Ginter (the ABSTRACT; col. 325,11. 1-67; col. 197,11. 42-65; col. 38,11. 35-67; col. 138, 11. 3-67; col. 156,11. 25-47; and col. 265,11. 28-67; col. 266,11. 1-67; col. 267,11. 1-67; col. 268,11. 1-67; col. 269,11. 1-67; col. 152, 11. 28-39; col. 154,11. 41-67; and col. 174,11. 22-35 and whole document) shows the elements and limitations of claim 17; however,

Ginter lacks an explicit recitation of "a header so that a media object profile is created for each media object..... even though;

Art Unit: 3622

Ginter (col. 109,11. 42-50; col. 111,11. 16-40; col. 311,11. 30-60; col. 137,11.3-67; col. 138,11. 1-67; col. 301, 11. 65-67; and col. 302,11. 1-15 ) suggests same.

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to a person of ordinary skill in the art that the disclosure of inter (col. 109, 11. 42-50; col. 111, 11. 16-40; col. 311, 11. 30-60; col. 137,11. 3-67; col. 138,11. 1-67; col. 301,11. 65-67; and col. 302,11. 115 ) would have been selected in accordance with "a header so that a media object profile is created for each media object. . . ." because such disclosure would have provided a method enabling *participants in a business value chain model to create an electronic version of traditional business agreement terms and conditions and further enables these participants to shape and evolve their electronic commerce models as they believe appropriate to their business requirements.* " (See inter col. 8,11. 40-49).

As per dependent claims 18-21, inter shows the method of claim 17 and subsequent base claims depending from claim 17.

Ginter lacks explicit recitation of the elements and limitations of claims 18-21, even though inter suggests same.

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to a person of ordinary skill in the art that the disclosure of inter (col. 137,11. 3-67; col. 138,11. 1-67; col. 301, 11. 65-67; col. 302,11. 1-15; the ABSTRACT; col. 325,11. 1-67; col. 197,11. 42-65; col. 38,11. 35-67; col. 138,11. 3-67; col. 156,11. 25-47; and col. 265,11. 28-67; col. 266,11. 167; col. 267,11. 1-67; col. 268,11. 1-67; col. 269,11. 1-67; col. 152, 11. 28-39; col. 154,11. 41-67; and col. 174,11. 22-35 and

Art Unit: 3622

whole document) would have been selected in *accordance with the elements and limitations of claims 18-21 because such disclosure would have provided a method enabling 'participants in a business value chain model to create an electronic version of traditional business agreement terms and conditions and further enables these participants to shape and evolve their electronic commerce models as they believe appropriate to their business requirements. " (See Gin col. 8,11. 4049).*

*As per independent claim 22, inter (col. 38,11. 35-67; col. 138,11. 3-67; col. 156,11. 25-47; and col. 265,11. 28-67; col. 266,11. 1-67; col. 267,11. 1-67; col. 268,11. 1-67; and col. 269,11. 1-67) discloses: "smart object agents. . . . "*

*Ginter (col. 325,11. 1-67) discloses: "target content object. . . . "*

*Ginter (col. 197,11. 42-65) discloses: "This mechanism could be used ... to distribute customized versions of a piece of content and control access to the various versions in the content object....."*

*Ginter (col. 152, 11. 28-39; col. 154,11. 41-67; and col. 174,11. 22-35) discloses: "collect data on end user usage activities. . . . "*

*Ginter (col. 137,11. 3-67; col. 138,11. 1-67; col. 301,11. 65-67; and col. 302,11. 115) shows "media content. . . ."*

*Ginter (col. 311, 11. 30-60) discloses: "account profile that may relate to such content to the repository....."*

Ginter (the ABSTRACT; col. 311,11. 30-60; col. 325,11. 1-67; col. 197,11. 4265; col. 38,11. 35-67; col. 138,11. 3-67; col. 156,11. 25-47; and col. 265,11. 28-67;

Art Unit: 3622

col. 266,11. 1-67; col. 267,11. 1-67; col. 268,11. 1-67; col. 269,11. 1-67; col. 152, 11. 28-39; col. 154,11. 41-67; and col. 174,11. 22-35 and whole document) shows the elements and limitations of claim 22; however,

Ginter lacks an explicit recitation of "a media object profile portion containing information gathered from a plurality of users representing exercise of said media object by said plurality of users. . . ." even though;

Ginter (col. 109,11. 42-50; col. 111,11. 16-40; col. 311,11. 30-60; col. 137,11. 3-67; col. 138,11. 1-67; col. 301,11. 65-67; and col. 302,11. 1-15 ) suggests same. . It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to a person of ordinary

skill in the art that the disclosure of inter (col. 109,11. 42-50; col. 111,11. 16-40; col. 311, 11. 30-60; col. 137,11. 3-67; col. 138,11. 1-67; col. 301,11. 65-67; and col. 302,11. 115 ) would have been selected in accordance with "a media object profile portion containing information gathered from a plurality of users representing exercise of said media object by said plurality of users. . . ." because such disclosure would have provided a method enabling *"participants in a business value chain model to create an electronic version of traditional business agreement terms and conditions and further enables these participants to shape and evolve their electronic commerce models as they believe appropriate to their business requirements. "* (See inter col. 8,11. 40-49).

As per dependent claims 23-24, inter shows the method of claim 22 and subsequent base claims depending from claim 22.

Ginter lacks explicit recitation of the elements and limitations of claims 23-24, even though Ginter suggests same.

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to a person of ordinary skill in the art that the disclosure of i to (col. 137, ll. 3-67; col. 138, ll. 1-67; col. 301, 11. 65-67; col. 302,11. 1-15; the ABSTRACT; col. 325,11. 1-67; col. 197,11.

42-65; col. 38,11. 35-67; col. 138,11. 3-67; col. 156,11. 25-47; and col. 265,11. 28-67;

col. 266,11. 167; col. 267,11. 1-67; col. 268, ll. 1-67; col. 269,11. 1-67; col. 152, 11.

28-39; col. 154,11. 41-67; and col. 174,11. 22-35 and whole document) would have

been selected in accordance with the elements and limitations of claims 23-24 because

such disclosure would have provided a method enabling *'participants in a business*

*value chain model to create an electronic version of traditional business agreement*

*terms and conditions and further enables these participants to shape and evolve their*

*electronic commerce models as they believe appropriate to their business requirements.*

" (See inter col. 8,11. 4049).

As per independent claim 25, in r (col. 38,11. 35-67; col. 138,11. 3-67; col. 156,11. 25-47; and col. 265,11. 28-67; col. 266,11. 1-67; col. 267,11. 1-67; col. 268, ll. 167; and col. 269,11. 1-67) discloses: "smart object agents. . . . "

Ginter (col. 325, 11. 1-67) discloses: "target content object. ....

Ginter (col. 50,11. 50-52) discloses: "FIG. 15A is an example of a channel header and channel detail records.....

Ginter (col. 109,11. 42-50; and col. 111, 11. 16-40) discloses: "relevant headers, content tags. . . . "

Ginter (col. 311, 11. 30-60) discloses: "account profile that may relate to such content to the repository. . . . "

Ginter (col. 197,11. 42-65) discloses: "This mechanism could be used... to distribute customized versions of a piece of content and control access to the various versions in the content object. . . . "

Art Unit: 3622

Ginter (col. 152, 11. 28-39; col. 154,11. 41-67; and col. 174,11. 22-35)

discloses: "collect data on end user usage activities....."

Ginter (col. 137,11. 3-67; col. 138,11. 1-67; col. 301,11. 65-67; and col. 302,11. 115) shows "media content. . . ."

As per independent claim 27, in e (col. 325,11. 1-67)  
discloses: "*target content object. . . .*"

Ginter (col. 197,11. 42-65) discloses: "*This mechanism could be used ... to distribute customized versions of a piece of content and control access to the various versions in the content object. . . .*"

Ginter (col. 38,11. 35-67; cot. 138,11. 3-67; cot. 156,11. 25-47; and cot. 265, 11. 28-67; cot. 266,11. 1-67; cot. 267,11. 1-67; cot. 268,11. 1-67; and cot. 269,11. 1-67) discloses: "smart object agents. . . ."

Ginter(cot. 152, 11. 28-39; cot. 154,11. 41-67; and cot. 174,11. 22-35)  
discloses: "collect data on end user usage activities. . . ."

Ginter (cot. 137,11. 3-67; cot. 138,11. 1-67; cot. 301,11. 65-67; and cot. 302, 11. 115) shows "media content....."

Ginter (the ABSTRACT; cot. 325,11. 1-67; cot. 197,11. 42-65; cot. 38,11. 35-67; cot. 138,11. 3-67; cot. 156,11. 25-47; and cot. 265,11. 28-67; cot. 266,11. 1-67; cot. 267,11. 1-67; cot. 268,11.1-67; cot. 269,11. 1-67; cot. 152, 11. 28-39; cot. 154,11. 41-67; and cot. 174,11. 22-35 and whole document) shows the elements and limitations of claim 27; however,

Ginter lacks an explicit recitation of "collecting information form a plurality of users related to the viewing of at least one media object. . . ." even though;

Art Unit: 3622

Ginter (cot. 152, 11. 28-39; cot. 154,11. 41-67; cot. 174,11. 22-35; cot. 137,11. 367; cot. 138,11. 1-67; cot. 301,11. 65-67; and cot. 302,11. 1-15) discloses: "collect data on end user usage activities. . . . " In this case, the Examiner interprets the disclosure of in e (cot. 152, 11. 28-39; cot. 154,11. 41-67; cot. 174,11. 22-35; cot. 137,11. 3-67; cot. 138,11. 1-67; cot. 301,11. 65-67; and cot. 302,11. 1-15) i.e., "collect data on end user *usage activities*..... as showing "collecting information form a plurality of users related to the viewing of at least one media object. . . ."

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to a person of ordinary skill in the art that the disclosure of inter (cot. 152, 11. 28-39; cot. 154,11. 41-67; cot. 174,11. 22-35; cot. 137,11.3-67; cot. 138,11. 1-67; cot. 301,11. 65-67; and cot. 302,11. 115) would have been selected in accordance with "collecting information form a plurality of users related to the viewing of at least one media object. . . ." because such disclosure would have provided a method enabling *'participants in a business value chain model to create an electronic version of traditional business agreement terms and conditions and further enables these participants to shape and evolve their electronic commerce models as they believe appropriate to their business requirements.*" (See Ginter cot. 8,11. 4049).

As per dependent claim 28, Ginter shows the method of claim 27.

Ginter lacks explicit recitation of the elements and limitations of claim 27, even though Ginter suggests same.

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to a person of ordinary skill in the art that the disclosure of Ginter (cot. 137,11. 3-67; cot. 138,11. 1-67; cot. 301, 11. 65-67;

Art Unit: 3622

cot. 302,11. 1-15; the ABSTRACT; cot. 325,11. 1-67; cot. 197,11. 42-65; cot. 38,11. 35-67; cot. 138,11. 3-67; cot. 156,11. 25-47; and cot. 265,11. 28-67; cot. 266,11. 1-

67; col. 267,11. 1-67; col. 268,11. 1-67; cot. 269,11. 1-67; cot. 152, 11. 28-39; cot.

154,11. 41-67; and cot. 174,11. 22-35 and whole document) would have been selected in

accordance with the elements and limitations of claim 28 because such disclosure would

have provided a method enabling *"participants in a business value chain model to create*

*an electronic version of traditional business agreement terms and conditions and further*

*enables these participants to shape and evolve their electronic commerce models as they*

*believe appropriate to their business requirements. "* (See inter cot. 8,11. 40-49).

As per independent claim 29, inter (cot. 325,11. 1-67) discloses: *"target content object.....*

Ginter (col. 311, 11. 30-60) discloses: *"account profile that may relate to such content to the repository. . . . "*

Ginter(col. 152, 11. 28-39; cot. 154,11. 41-67; and cot. 174,11. 22-35) discloses: *"collect data on end user usage activities. . . . "*

Ginter (cot. 18,11. 38-67; cot. 19,11. 10; col. 25,11. 1-35; cot. 37,11. 15-67; col. 38, 11. 1-35; cot. 307,11. 5-30; and col. 338,11. 10-67 ) shows "collecting information from users of Internet links; correlating the collected information with at least one Internet link; creating an Internet link profile based on the correlated information; and selecting at least one Internet link based on the profile of a user requested link.....

Ginter (col. 137,11. 3-67; col. 138,11. 1-67; col. 301,11. 65-67; and col.

302,11. 115) shows "media content...."



Art Unit: 3622

Ginter (the ABSTRACT; col. 325,11. 1-67; col. 197,11. 42-65; col. 38,11. 35-67; col. 138,11. 3-67; col. 156,11. 25-47; and col. 265,11. 28-67; col. 266,11. 1-67; col. 267, 11. 1-67; col. 268,11. 1-67; col. 269,11. 1-67; col. 152, 11. 28-39; col. 154,11. 41-67; and col. 174,11. 22-35 and whole document) shows the elements and limitations of claim 29; however,

Ginter lacks an explicit recitation of "collecting information from users of Internet links; correlating the collected information with at least one Internet link; creating an Internet link profile based on the correlated information; and selecting at least one Internet link based on the profile of a user requested link..... even though;

Ginter (col. 18,11. 38-67; col. 19, 11. 10; col. 25,11. 1-35; col. 37, 11. 15-67; col. 38,11. 1-35; col. 307,11. 5-30; and col. 338,11. 10-67; the ABSTRACT; col. 325,11. 1-67; col. 197,11. 42-65; col. 38,11. 35-67; col. 138,11. 3-67; col. 156,11. 25-47; and col. 265, 11. 28-67; col. 266,11. 1-67; col. 267,11. 1-67; col. 268,11. 1-67; col. 269,11. 1-67; col. 152, 11. 28-39; col. 154,11. 41-67; and col. 174,11. 22-35 and whole document) suggests same. It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to a person of ordinary skill in the art that the disclosure of Ginter (col. 18,11. 38-67; col. 19,11. 10; col. 25,11. 1-35; col. 37,11. 15-67; col. 38,11. 1-35; col. 307, 11. 5-30; and col. 338,11. 10-67; the ABSTRACT; col. 325,11. 1-67; col. 197,11. 42-65; col. 38,11.35-67; col. 138,11. 3-67; col. 156,11. 25-47; and col. 265,11. 28-67; col. 266,11. 1-67; col. 267,11. 1-67; col. 268,11. 1-67; col. 269,11. 1-67; col. 152, 11. 28-39; col. 154,11. 41-67; and col. 174,11. 22-35 and whole document) would have been selected in accordance with "collecting information from users of Internet links; correlating the collected information with at least one Internet link; creating an Internet link profile based on the correlated information; and selecting at least one Internet link based on the profile of a user requested link. . . ." because such disclosure would have provided a method enabling *'participants in a business value chain model to create an electronic*

Art Unit: 3622

*version of traditional business agreement terms and conditions and further enables these participants to shape and evolve their electronic commerce models as they believe appropriate to their business requirements. " (See inter col. 8,11. 40-49).*

As per dependent claim 30, Ginter shows the method of claim 29.

Ginter lacks explicit recitation of the elements and limitations of claim 29, even though Ginter suggests same.

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to a person of ordinary skill in the art that the disclosure of     inte (col. 18,11. 38-67; col. 19,11. 10; col. 25,11. 135; col. 37,11. 15-67; col. 38,11. 1-35; col. 307,11. 5-30; and col. 338,11. 10-67 ) would have been selected in accordance with the elements and limitations of claim 30 because such disclosure would have provided a method enabling *'participants in a business value*

*chain model to create an electronic version of traditional business agreement terms and conditions and further enables these participants to shape and evolve their electronic commerce models as they believe appropriate to their business requirements. " (See Ginter col. 8,11. 40-49).*

As per dependent claim 31, Ginter shows the method of claim 29.

Ginter lacks explicit recitation of the elements and limitations of claim 29, even though Ginter suggests the same.

Art Unit: 3622

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to a person of ordinary skill in the art that the disclosure of Ginter (cot. 18,11. 38-67; cot. 19,11. 10; cot. 25,11. 135; cot. 37,11. 15-67; cot. 38,11. 1-35; col. 307,11. 5-30; and cot. 338,11. 10-67 ) would have been selected in accordance with the elements and limitations of claim 31 because such disclosure would have provided a method enabling *participants in a business value chain model to create an electronic version of traditional business agreement terms and conditions and further enables these participants to shape and evolve their electronic commerce models as they believe appropriate to their business requirements.* " (See Ginter col. 8,11. 40-49).

Additionally, Ginter discloses utilization of multimedia objects, audio, audio-visual, video, e-commerce:

"(73) Information distributed using VDE may take many forms. It may, for example, be "distributed" for use on an individual's own computer, that is the present invention can be used to provide security for locally stored data. Alternatively, VDE may be used with information that is dispersed by authors and/or publishers to one or more recipients. This information may take many forms including: movies, audio recordings, games, electronic catalog shopping, multimedia, training materials, E-mail and personal documents, object oriented libraries, software programming resources, and reference/record keeping information resources (such as business, medical, legal, scientific, governmental, and consumer databases)" (col 7, lines 45-57).

Ginter also discloses utilizing the Internet and links:

Art Unit: 3622

“(570) If External Services Manager 772 is used to access VDE objects, many different techniques are possible. For example, the VDE objects may be formatted for use with the World Wide Web protocols (HTML, HTTP, and URL) by including relevant headers, content tags, host ID to URL conversion (e.g., using Name Services Manager 752) and an HTTP-aware instance of Services Transport Layer 786” (col 109, lines 41-50).

Also, Ginter discloses utilizing the Internet, sending users content, profiling users, tracking user activity, keeping a user activity history, and advertising (the above citations from the Ginter reference; the citations from the preceding rejection referring to the Ginter reference, throughout the Ginter reference; and below):

“(10) The present invention can materially enhance the revenue of content providers, lower the distribution costs and the costs for content, better support advertising and usage information gathering, and better satisfy the needs of electronic information users. These improvements can lead to a significant increase in the amount and variety of electronic information and the methods by which such information is distributed” (col 1, line 65-col 2, line 9).

Ginter does not explicitly disclose targeting users.

Gerace discloses utilizing multimedia objects, audio, audio-visual, video, e-commerce, the Internet, website, links, and advertising (col 1, lines 20-45; col 3, lines 5-10; col 2, lines 35-42).

Gerace further discloses identifying specific media objects based on user activity with that same object or another object and targeting the specific media object to the user (col 2, lines 1-60; col 6, line 57-col 7, line 25; col 20, lines 9-19).

Gerace further discloses a "smart media object" having a profile portion containing information gathered from a plurality of users representing exercise of the media object portion by the plurality of users (col 20, lines 9-20; col 18, lines 10-26; col 33, lines 55-col 34, line 25).

Gerace further discloses a method of targeting media objects to a user on-line wherein at least one Internet link based on the profile of a user requested link is delivered to the user with at least one additional link having a link profile matching at least one aspect of the profile of the requested link (col 16, lines 36-55; col 14, lines 24-35).

Gerace further discloses a "hidden search engine" that creates a profile for Internet links and selects at least one Internet link based on at least one aspect of each link profile for delivery with a user requested link to the user (col 16, lines 36-55; col 14, lines 24-35). Notice that in this citation from Gerace that Gerace presents specific banner advertising based on information known about that banner advertising and a determination as to how well suited that banner advertising is for presenting at a specific time or situation. Also, notice that the appropriateness of presenting the advertising is determined based on what is known about the advertising compared with a combination of information known about that user, the current information on display to the user, and the current information requested by the user.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add Gerace's further features on tracking user responses to content and targeting a user to Ginter's presenting a user content and profiling a user. One would have been motivated to do this in order to better present a user with information of interest.

***Response to Arguments***

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-7, 9-15, 17-20, 22, 23 and 27-31 have been considered but are not found persuasive.

Beginning on page 1 of the Applicant's Amendment dated 12/7/2005, Applicant states that there is no motivation to combine Ginter and Gerace.

In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

In response to applicant's argument that Ginter and Gerace are nonanalogous art, it has been held that a prior art reference must either be in the field of applicant's endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the applicant was concerned, in order to be relied upon as a basis for rejection of the claimed invention. See *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 24 USPQ2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge

Art Unit: 3622

generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

In this case, Ginter discloses advertising, Internet advertising, maximizing advertising revenues, delivering preferred content to a user, and profiling a user (below Ginter citations and throughout the Ginter reference):

"The present invention can materially enhance the revenue of content providers, lower the distribution costs and the costs for content, better support advertising and usage information gathering, and better satisfy the needs of electronic information users. These improvements can lead to a significant increase in the amount and variety of electronic information and the methods by which such information is distributed (col 1, line 65-col 2, line 9);

Frequently, for a VDE application for a given content model (such as distribution of entertainment on CD-ROM, content delivery from an Internet repository, or electronic catalog shopping and advertising, or some combination of the above) participants would be able to securely select from amongst available, alternative control methods and apply related parameter data, wherein such selection of control method and/or submission of data would constitute their "contribution" of control information (col 18, lines 55-65).

Reporting of usage information and user requests can be used for supporting electronic currency, billing, payment and credit related activities, and/or for user profile analysis and/or broader market survey analysis and marketing (consolidated) list generation or other information derived, at least in part, from said usage information. this information can

Art Unit: 3622

be provided to content providers or other parties, through secure, authenticated encrypted communication to the VDE installation secure subsystems” (col 36, lines 26-38).

Gerace discloses Internet advertising, maximizing advertising revenue, delivering content and advertising of interest to the user, and targeting the user.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add Gerace’s further features on tracking user responses to content and targeting a user to Ginter’s presenting a user content and profiling a user. One would have been motivated to do this in order to better present a user with information of interest.

Beginning on page 2, Applicant states that Gerace does not disclose, “identifying specific media objects based on user activity with that same object or another object and targeting the specific media object to the user”.

Examiner further notes that it is the Applicant’s claims as stated in the Applicant’s claims that are being rejected with the prior art. Also, although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). And, Examiner notes that claims are given their broadest reasonable construction. See *In re Hyatt*, 211 F.3d 1367, 54 USPQ2d 1664 (Fed. Cir. 2000).

Examiner notes that while specific references were made to the prior art, it is actually also the prior art in its entirety and the combination of the prior art in its entirety that is being referred to. Also, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).



Art Unit: 3622

Also, the test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981).

However, Gerace discloses these features (see the above rejection and Gerace at: Fig. 2; Fig. 3a; Fig. 3f; Fig. 3g; col 5, lines 15-25; col 20, lines 9-20; col 6, line 57-col 7, line 45; col 33, line 35-col 34, line 27).

Also, on page 2, Applicant states that the combination of the prior art does not render obvious, “delivering said user requested media object with said second media object having an object profile matching said user requested object. . .” and also “selecting a smart media object having. . .”.

Gerace further discloses profiles and classifications for content objects (col 3, lines 5-10).

Gerace further discloses matching content object profiles relative to characteristics of requested user information and also matching secondary or additional content objects relative to other content objects presented on a page or requested by a user (col 16, lines 36-55). Notice in this citation that Gerace discloses delivering content objects based upon the requested type of information the user has entered. Also, notice in this citation that Gerace discloses delivering advertisements or second media objects (“. . .return appropriate advertisements. . .” from col 16, lines 36-55) that are relevant to the first media object that the user has requested (which in this case is information on Detroit).

Hence, the combination of Ginter and Gerace renders obvious the features of the Applicant's claims.

***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Arthur Duran whose telephone number is (571) 272-6718. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon- Fri, 8:00-4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eric Stamber can be reached on (571) 272-6724. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3622

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Arthur Duran', with a stylized, cursive script.

Arthur Duran  
Primary Examiner  
1/6/2006